

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ronale Bea-Mone, III, ) Case No. 8:17-cv-00550-JLS-DFM  
)  
Plaintiff, ) **[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT**  
) **AND ORDER**  
vs. )  
)  
Steven D. Silverstein, Attorney at Law, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Plaintiff Ronale Bea-Mone, III (“Plaintiff”) commenced this civil action against Defendant Steven D. Silverstein, Attorney at Law (“Defendant”) on March 27, 2017. A jury trial was held before this Court on November 13, 2018. Plaintiff appeared by his attorneys Russell S. Thompson, IV and Amorette Rinkleib. Defendant appeared by his attorneys Dale V. Goldfarb and Larry Rothman.

The jury, having heard the testimony and considered the evidence, found as follows:

1           1.     Plaintiff proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Defendant is  
2 a “debt collector” under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) at 15  
3 U.S.C. § 1692a(6);  
4

5           2.     Plaintiff proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Defendant  
6 violated the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. §1692g(a) by failing to provide Plaintiff with the  
7 required notices in Defendant’s Notice or in writing within five days thereafter;  
8

9           3.     Defendant failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that his  
10 violation of the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) was unintentional and the result of  
11 a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted  
12 to avoid any such error(s);  
13  
14

15           4.     Plaintiff proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Defendant  
16 violated the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) by threatening to take an action that  
17 was not intended to be taken in Defendant’s Notice;  
18

19           5.     Defendant failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that his  
20 violation of the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) was unintentional and the result of  
21 a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted  
22 to avoid any such error(s);  
23  
24

25           6.     Plaintiff proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Defendant  
26 violated the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) by failing to disclose that he was  
27  
28

1 “attempting to collect a debt and that any information obtained will be used for that  
2 purpose” as required by the FDCPA; and

3 7. Defendant failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that his  
4 violation of the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) was unintentional and the result  
5 of a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably  
6 adapted to avoid any such error(s); and  
7

8 8. Plaintiff is entitled to maximum statutory damages in the amount of  
9 \$1,000.00, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A).  
10

11 It is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that judgment is  
12 entered for \$1,000.00 in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant. Pursuant to Local  
13 Rules 54-10 and 54-11, Plaintiff’s motion for attorneys’ fees and costs shall be  
14 served and filed within fourteen (14) days after the entry of this final judgment.  
15

16 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Josephine L. Staton  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28